



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/594,808	06/16/2000	Jin Soo Lee	CIT/K-114	9678

7590

06/10/2002

The Law Offices of
Fleshner & Kim
P O Box 221200
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CAM LINH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/594,808

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Cam-Linh T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1 - 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- The preamble of the independent claims 1, 8, 14, 17, and dependent claims promises browsing using a multilevel object data structure, but the body of the claims fails to address such a structure. In the interest of compact prosecution, it is assumed that an image with annotations is a multilevel object.
- Claim 2 is referred to the phase "a particular program". Applicant didn't provide enough information to explain this phase in the specification. In the interest of compact prosecution, it is assumed that a program is a category of object.
- Claims 2 - 4, 8 - 10, 14 - 16 referred to the phase "real information" and "content information", but applicant didn't provide enough information to explain this phase in the specification. In the interest of compact prosecution, it is assumed this is data in an annotation.
- Claims 4, 10, are recites the limitation "image or graphic information on **the character**" in line 1 of page 15, line 4 of page 16 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2171

- Claims 5 and 11 were not clearly described the limitation of "image information on the object information"

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1 – 2, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Balogh et al (U.S. 5,493,677).

♦ As per claim 1,

- "Multilevel object data structure" is referred as image and annotations as shown in Fig 6 element 602, 610, and 604.
- "Receiving multimedia information and multiple supplementary information" See Fig. 3 element 250 and 262, column 3 line 10 – 43, column 8 line 64 – column 9 line 15.
- "Separating the multimedia information and the multiple supplementary information" See Fig. 6 column 5 line 48 – column 6 line 5.
- "Displaying the multimedia information" See Fig. 6 element 602, column 5 line 51 – 55.
- "Browsing/searching supplementary information" fig. 1 element 126, column 4 line 15 – 47, column 3 line 5.

Art Unit: 2171

- "Displaying the supplementary information when a user requests for browsing/searching the supplementary information" See Fig. 14, column 17 line 14 – 22.

♦ As per claim 2,

- "Content information on a particular program in the multimedia information" is referred as "Caption 604" in Fig. 6 element 604, column 3 line 10 – 43, column 7 line 42 - 63.
- "Multiple supplementary information including real information" is referred as "Bibliographic data 610". See Fig. 6 element 610, column 3 line 10 – 43.

♦ As per claim 8,

The elements of claim 8 are rejected in the analysis above, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3 - 7, 9 - 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balogh et al (U.S. 5,493,677) in view of Lagarde et al (U.S. 5,710,918).

♦ As per claim 3 – 4, 9 – 10, 15 – 16, 18,

- "Text information describing character of the object" See Fig. 14 element 1406, column 3 line 10 – 43, column 17 line 14 – 22 of Balogh.

Art Unit: 2171

Balogh fail to disclose the relationship of object information in a graph. However, Lagarde et al (U.S. 5,710,918), discloses in the invention a graph that show the relationship between different objects in the environments (See Fig. 9 of Lagarde), and the objects can be different type such as image, voice, multimedia presentation (see column 10 line 60 – 65 of Lagarde). It was well known in the art at the time of the invention was made to display graphs of related objects and processes, as taught by Lagarde (See Fig. 9). In Lagarde, Query database (91a) is a place, “calculate data” (93) is an event, and both the “multi-joint” (92) and “data format” (94) are objects. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply this technique to any combination of object, event, and place because this illustrates the relationships between them.

♦ As per claim 5 - 7, 11 – 13,

- “Text information having information describing the object” See fig. 3 element 262 of Balogh.
- “Image information” See fig. 3 element 250 of Balogh.
- “Information on location” See column 3 line 19 – 20 of Balogh.

♦ As per claims 14, 17,

The limitations in claims 14 and 17 are rejected in the analysis above, and those claims are rejected on that basis.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2171

- Jain et al (U.S. 6,144,375) teaches a multi-perspective viewer for content-based interactivity.
- Schileru-Key Rodica (U.S. 6,388,688) teaches a graph-based visual navigation through spatial environments.
- Tan et al (U.S. 6,356,902) teaches a method and system for storage and retrieval of multimedia objects.
- Shusaku Okamoto (U.S. 5,684,999) teaches an apparatus and a method for retrieving image objects based on correlation with natural language sentence parameters.
- Yoshito Ohta (U.S. 5,878,277) teaches a communication system having at least two types of communication channels.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam-Linh T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-1951. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/594,808

Page 7

Art Unit: 2171

Cam-Linh Nguyen

Art Unit 2171

Way S
WAYNE AMSBURY
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER